

Honorable John C. Coughenour

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

CHARLES G. MOORE AND KATHLEEN F. MOORE,)	
)	Case No. 2:19-cv-1539-JCC
Plaintiffs,)	
)	STIPULATED MOTION TO FILE
v.)	OVER-LENGTH BRIEFS AND SET
)	EXTENDED BRIEFING SCHEDULE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,)	
)	NOTE ON MOTION CALENDAR:
Defendant.)	February 18, 2020
_____)	

Pursuant to LCR 7(f) and Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(b), the undersigned parties hereby request approval to file an over-length motion to dismiss and opposition thereto, and to set an extended briefing schedule. The parties request ten (10) additional pages for their respective briefs, for a total of 34 pages each. The parties also request that the Court set March 27, 2020 as the deadline for filing an opposition to the motion to dismiss, and April 27, 2020 as the deadline for filing a reply. The reasons are as follows:

1. The Complaint presents novel legal issues, namely, constitutional challenges to the “mandatory repatriation tax” under the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act of 2017. Dkt. No. 1.
2. The United States’ response to the Complaint is due February 24, 2020. Dkt. No. 23. The United States intends to file a motion to dismiss.

1 3. The typical page limit for a motion to dismiss is 24 pages. LCR 7(e)(3).

2 4. The nature of the legal arguments—not to mention the policy impact of a statute
3 potentially being invalidated—justifies allowing the United States ten (10) additional pages for
4 its motion to dismiss, and the Moores a corresponding number of extra pages for their
5 opposition. *See* LCR 7(f)(4). The Complaint raises two constitutional challenges to the
6 “mandatory repatriation tax” (26 U.S.C. § 965): an Apportionment Clause challenge and a Due
7 Process Clause (retroactivity) challenge. Dkt. No. 1 at 6-8. As far as the parties know, this is the
8 first case in any court to raise either of those issues with respect to the “mandatory repatriation
9 tax.”

10 5. A motion to dismiss also potentially disposes of the case, which would obviate the
11 need for discovery or trial. Judicial economy is served by addressing the legal issues upfront.

12 6. In addition, good cause exists under Rule 6(b) for an extended briefing schedule.

13 7. The local rules generally allow 2-3 weeks for an opposition to a motion to
14 dismiss, and 4-7 days for a reply. LCR 7(d)(3).

15 8. Due to the nature of the legal arguments involved, the parties need additional time
16 to research the relevant issues and ensure they can fully brief the Court.

17 9. Furthermore, the briefing on both sides will require extra scrutiny due to the
18 nature and policy impact of this case, in particular on the government’s end.

19 10. Accordingly, the parties believe it is reasonable to allow 5 weeks to file an
20 opposition, and 4 weeks to file a reply, on the United States’ motion to dismiss.

21 WHEREFORE, the United States, Charles Moore, and Kathleen Moore respectfully
22 request that the Court grant ten (10) additional pages for a motion to dismiss and the opposition
23
24

thereto, and set an extended briefing schedule with the opposition due March 27, 2020, and the reply due April 27, 2020.

Dated: February 18, 2020

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Andrew M. Grossman

Andrew M. Grossman (*pro hac vice*)

BAKER & HOSTETLER LLP

Washington Square, Suite 1100

1050 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.

Washington, D.C. 20036-5304

Tel: (202) 861-1500

Fax: (202) 861-1783

agrossman@bakerlaw.com

Attorney for Plaintiffs Charles and Kathleen Moore

RICHARD E. ZUCKERMAN

Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General

/s/ Jennifer Y. Golden

JENNIFER Y. GOLDEN

Trial Attorney

KARI M. LARSON

Senior Litigation Counsel

U.S. Department of Justice, Tax Division

P.O. Box 683, Ben Franklin Station

Washington, D.C. 20044

Tel: 202-616-3822 (Larson)

Tel: 202-307-6547 (Golden)

Fax: 202-307-0054

Kari.M.Larson@usdoj.gov

Jennifer.Y.Golden@usdoj.gov

Attorneys for Defendant United States of America

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on February 18, 2020, I served a copy of the foregoing document by filing a copy through the Court's CM/ECF system, which will send an electronic copy to:

James R. Morrison (jmorrison@bakerlaw.com)

Baker & Hostetler LLP

999 Third Avenue

Suite 3600

Seattle, WA 98104-4040

Andrew M. Grossman (agrossman@bakerlaw.com)

David B. Rivkin, Jr. (drivkin@bakerlaw.com)

Jeffrey H. Paravano (jparavano@bakerlaw.com)

Katherine L. McKnight (kmcknight@bakerlaw.com)

Nicholas C. Mowbray (nmowbray@bakerlaw.com)

Baker & Hostetler LLP

Washington Square, Suite 1100

1050 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.

Washington, D.C. 20036-5304

Competitive Enterprise Institute

Sam Kazman (Sam.Kazman@cei.org)

Devin Watkins (Devin.Watkins@cei.org)

1310 L Street NW, 7th Floor

Washington, D.C. 20005

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Jennifer Y. Golden

JENNIFER Y. GOLDEN

Trial Attorney, Tax Division

U.S. Department of Justice